



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| APPLICATION NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

08/459,788

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

27

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William Luther (3) _____
(2) Tom Scott (4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 7, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: n/a

Identification of prior art discussed:

n/a

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Ex'r requests clarification for when applicants intend to honor their agreement, made aprox. 1 1/2 year ago, to consolidate this application (see attachment 3 when, after the ~1/99 agreement, applicants actually acted on the agreement as early as 3/9/99). Ex'r notes that applicants have alleged that the 'agreement to consolidate' corresponds to the process illustrated in attachment 1's step 2 wherein applicants have alleged they would necessarily provide the interview summary corresponding to attachment 2 for meeting attachment 1's step 2. However, applicants have failed, to date, to provide attachment 2 for meeting attachment 1; accordingly, applicants have failed to meet their commitment for providing attachment 2, and their commitment for performing the instant consolidation.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

(703) 328-6609